

10/531,341

**REMARKS**

The present Response After Final Rejection is submitted in response to the Final Official Action of July 13, 2007 and thereby within two months of the mailing date of the Final Office Action. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following Response After Final before reconsideration of the present Application, and allowance of the present Application as amended herein or, if the Examiner deems necessary, timely issuance of an Advisory Action.

Claims 3-6 are presently pending in the Application and the Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5 and 6 are allowable over the art of record in this case.

The Examiner rejects claims 3 and 4, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over the previously cited combination of DE '497 A1 in view of Newbigging '893. In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner points out that claim 3 recites that the locking device is connected from the second set of valves, rather than explicitly reciting the distinguishing limitations that the locking device is actuated by the second set of valves--as recited in allowed claim 5. The Applicant also notes that claim 3, unlike claim 5, also does not explicitly recite the distinguishing limitation that the locking device is actuated by the second set of valves according to the gear ratio range of the second set of valves.

In response, claim 3 is amended above to include the limitations that the locking device is actuated by the second set of valves and that the actuation is according to the gear range of the second set of valves. It will be noted that these amendments are fully supported by the specification, the drawings and the claims, as originally filed, and that these amendments do not add any new matter to the invention, the specification and/or the claims. Further, it is the Applicant's belief that amended claim 3 now clearly distinguishes over the cited prior art, under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103, for the reasons discussed in the Response of April 19, 2007 to the previous Official Action, and for the same reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

8/30/07 - 11:42 A M

- 4 -

10/531,341

It is further the Applicant's belief that because claim 4 depends from claim 3, and thereby incorporates all of the recitations and the limitations of claim 3, claim 4 is likewise allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 3 is allowable.

In conclusion, the Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 3 and 4, and allow pending claims 3- 6.

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the Birk et al. '497 and/or Newbigging '893 references, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.


8/30/07 11:48 A M

- 5 -

10/531,341

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018  
Customer No. 020210  
Davis Bujold & Daniels, P.L.L.C.  
112 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301-2931  
Telephone 603-226-7490  
Facsimile 603-226-7499  
E-mail: [patent@davisandbujold.com](mailto:patent@davisandbujold.com)

000007 11/27/07